



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

MF

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

08/893,917 07/11/97 LITTAU

K AM2119/T2130

IM62/0504

APPLIED MATERIALS INC
PATENT COUNSEL MS 2061
LEGAL AFFAIRS DEPT
PO BOX 450A
SANTA CLARA CA 95052

EXAMINER

ZERVIGON, R

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1763

DATE MAILED:

05/04/00

12

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Interview Summary

Application No.
08/893,917

Applicant(s)
Littau et al

Examiner
Rudy Zervigon

Group Art Unit
1763



All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Rudy Zervigon (3) _____
(2) Chun-Pok Leung (4) _____

Date of Interview Apr 25, 2000

Type: ☒ Telephonic ☐ Personal (copy is given to applicant applicant's representative).

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: ☐ Yes ☒ No. If yes, brief description:

Agreement ☐ was reached. ☒ was not reached.

Claim(s) discussed: 21

Identification of prior art discussed:

Kawamura (U.S. Pat. 5,328,558) and Moslehi (U.S. Pat. 5,403,434).

Description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

Mr. Leung first addressed the anticipation of claim 21 over Kawamura. Specifically, the "mixing" of nonplasma and plasma gasses could be further qualified to address a more volumetric or gaseous mixing. The Moslehi patent was discussed at length with reference to the "T" piping of figure 1 and column 11, lines 37-45 which, in the view of the Examiner remains anticipatory of the presently amended claim 21.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments, if available, which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments which would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

1. ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview.

Unless the paragraph above has been checked to indicate to the contrary, A FORMAL WRITTEN RESPONSE TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION IS NOT WAIVED AND MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a response to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW.

2. ☐ Since the Examiner's interview summary above (including any attachments) reflects a complete response to each of the objections, rejections and requirements that may be present in the last Office action, and since the claims are now allowable, this completed form is considered to fulfill the response requirements of the last Office action. Applicant is not relieved from providing a separate record of the interview unless box 1 above is also checked.

Marian C. Knode
MARIAN C. KNODE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1700

Examiner Note: You must sign and stamp this form unless it is an attachment to a signed Office action.